DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 345 328 EA 023 795

AUTHOR Simms, M. H.; And Others
TITLE The Kentucky Supervisor: A Self Analysis.
PUB DATE Oct 89
NOTE 41p.; Paper presented at the Annual Joint Meeting of the Kentucky Educational Supervisor Association and the Kentucky Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (Lexington, KY, October 30-November 1, 1989).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Characteristics; *Administrator Responsibility; Administrator Role; Elementary Secondary Education; *Quality of Working Life; *Supervisors; *Teacher Supervision; Work Environment
IDENTIFIERS *Kentucky

ABSTRACT

Findings from a study that described the responsibilities and characteristics of Kentucky school district instructional supervisors are presented in this paper. Instructional supervisors are those district personnel who are responsible for the professional development of teachers. Questionnaires mailed to 184 Kentucky instructional supervisors produced 104 usable returns, an approximate 57 percent response rate. Among the findings found were: (1) more than half were between 40 and 50 years of age (consistent with similar studies of principals in Kentucky and Tennessee); (2) almost one-half (46.05%) were female (not consistent with similar studies of educational administrators); (3) almost all were whites with few minorities; (4) almost three-fourths were responsible for supervision from kindergarten through grade 12; (5) a mean salary of $39,673; and (6) 25% obtained their bachelor's degree from a college or university in Kentucky. Overall, supervisors reported that they had too many responsibilities within the organizational framework of the school district, but were basically satisfied with their inservice training and the current certification practices. Twenty-seven tables highlight the survey results. (15 references) (LMI)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED345328

THE KENTUCKY SUPERVISOR:

A SELF ANALYSIS

M. H. SIMMS
M. D. RICHARDSON
R. L. PRICKETT

A paper presented for presentation at the annual meeting of the **Kentucky Educational Supervisor Association/Kentucky Association for Supervision and Curriculum Developemtn** in Lexington, KY on October 30-November 1, 1989.

Margaret Sims is a teacher in Nelson County, KY, **Mike Richardson** is assistant professor and coordinator of Educational Administration, and **Robert Prickett** is assistant professor, both at **Western Kentucky University**, Bowling Green, KY (502-745-4890).

EA 023 795

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

M. D. Richardson

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

THE KENTUCKY SUPERVISOR: A SELF ANALYSIS

School systems typically have on their staff persons listed as "instructional" supervisors who have as their goal the professional development of teachers. However, the role of the instructional supervisor has changed significantly during the past few years. Particularly since 1980, with the advent of the effective schools movement and educational reform, the functions of supervisors have changed.

Many supervisors have taken on added duties and responsibilities as assigned by the superintendent as they have been asked to do more tasks and be competent in more areas than ever before. School systems perceived and utilized the instructional supervisor in varied ways. In some systems, for example, supervisors took on tasks which included textbook inventory, curriculum handbook writer, liaison to different committees in the school system, and sometimes a "go for."

BACKGROUND

A database or demographic profile regarding the instructional supervisors in the Commonwealth of Kentucky did not exist.

A total population of 184 instructional supervisors were identified in the Commonwealth of Kentucky. The researchers consolidated information from available sources to develop a questionnaire. The questionnaire was then administered to two separate graduate educational leadership classes at Western Kentucky University to field test the instrument. The resulting

WKU—Printing paid from state funds, KRS 57.375.

instrument, the Kentucky Supervisor's Questionnaire (KAQ) was administered to the total population of instructional supervisors in the Commonwealth of Kentucky.

SUPERVISION

Supervision has been defined in a myraid of terms by various researchers. Probably the most succinct definition would be: supervision is a process designed to assist teachers in providing learning opportunities for students. The supervisor's goal is both long-term and short-term in nature. Teachers need assistance in solving immediate problems, but they also need the support of supervisors as they cooperatively search for ways to improve teaching and learning. Clearly, supervision is a long-term, continuous process that requires cooperation from all parties concerned; teachers, supervisors, and administrators.

The purpose of supervision is the improvement of the instructional program. Efficient supervisors possess three kinds of skills: human, managerial, and technical (Katz, 1955). Mann (1965) restated Katz's work and described three classifications of supervisory skills as human, technical, and administrative or managerial. He further stated that the mix of these skills is the key to supervisory competence.

According to Mann (1965), technical skill is defined as the specialized knowledge and ability required to perform the primary tasks that are required in a supervisory position. Human relation skills involve the ability to work with people and to motivate them so they will desire to do their best. The

administrative or managerial skill refers to the ability to make decisions and see relationships that are important to the organization to which the supervisor is responsible. The supervisory mix concept is applicable to any educational organization even though different skills are required at different levels (Alfonso, Firth, & Neville, 1984).

Alfonso, Firth & Neville (1984) postulate that a major deterrent to the full professional status of educational supervisors is the lack of an agreed-upon set of professional skills as well as an ill-defined knowledge base. Most skills used by supervisors are those acquired on the job rather than from and/or during professional preparation.

Teachers constantly report that they receive their primary help from other teachers (Alfonzo & Goldsberry, 1982) and they are highly critical of the amount and quality of assistance they receive from their instructional leaders. (Alfonso, Firth, & Neville, 1981). Consequently, teachers are often forced to seek elsewhere when their local instructional supervisor(s) lack the skills directly related to the work of classroom teachers. Whether supervisors are actually deficient in such skills or only perceived in that light by teachers, the results are the same. Because of this, supervision is frequently seen as unrelated to the improvement of instruction Reyes, 1986). Occasional visits by an instructional supervisor to individual classrooms continues to emphasize for teachers that the main function of supervision is administrative monitoring (Alfonso, Firth & Neville 1984).

. The supervisor's most essential task is his/her responsibility for improving instruction (Cogan, 1973). Supervisors are expected to perform the duties of being "instructional experts, diagnosticians, curriculum developers, instructional planners, problem solvers, innovators, clinical observation specialists, and managers of the processes of teaching and learning" (Alfonso, Firth & Neville 1984, p. 17). Goldsberry (1984) states that the primary function of supervisors is to help teachers refine classroom practices through direct observation and conference. Supervisors can help improve teaching by supplementing classroom observations with analysis of the learning materials teachers use (McGreal, Broderick, & Jones, 1984)

Acheson and Gall (1987) emphasized that with all the supervisor's duties little time was allocated for observing teachers. In addition to the number of teachers to be supervised, the supervisor is left with observations resembling a Polaroid picture -- a single perspective, frozen in time, often posed, and only seemingly objective. In actual fact, the picture is actually dependent upon the photographer (supervisor's) ability to capture the relevant situation, not the superficial (Dunkleberger, 1982).

Supervisors may visit any classroom, but they must be psychologically accepted by the teacher if the process is to be anything more than a ritual. Most teachers desire to improve their skills -- to be better teachers (Glickman & Gordon, 1987). Supervisors can help teachers increase mastery of teaching which

leads to a confirmation of the teachers's self-worth. By helping teachers to become better, supervisors help teachers to become more motivated. Teachers who are concerned with high-quality performance tend to have a deep emotional and intellectual stake in what they do, resulting in fear of change. Therefore, any changes advocated by the supervision should fit an individual teachers' belief system about good teaching (June, Wenger, & Guetti, 1987). The supervisor should provide services to the necessary extent that the teacher will invite the supervisor willingly into the classroom (Blumberg & Jonas, 1987).

METHODOLOGY

The Kentucky Supervisor's Questionnaire was mailed on March 14, 1989, to all instructional supervisors in the Commonwealth of Kentucky who were identified from records of Kentucky State Department of Education. Included in the mailing were the following a questionnaire, a cover letter, and a business reply envelop for return of the questionnaire. Of the 184 questionnaires mailed, 104 were returned for a 56.9 percent response.

TABLE I

AGE OF RESPONDENTS

AGE		N	%
60+		6	6.06
55-59		12	12.12
50-54		18	18.18
45-49		28	28.28
40-44		28	28.28
35-39		7	7.08
TOTALS	**x=47**	**99**	**100.00**

TABLE II

GENDER OF RESPONDENTS

GENDER	N	%
Male	55	53.92
Female	47	46.08
TOTALS	**102**	**100.00**

TABLE III

MARITAL STATUS OF RESPONDENTS

MARITAL STATUS	N	%
Single	6	6.00
Married	84	84.00
Divorced	7	7.00
Widowed	3	3.00
TOTALS	**100**	**100.00**

TABLE IV

RACE OF RESPONDENTS

RACE	N	%
White	101	99.02
Black	1	.98
TOTALS	102	100.00

TABLE V

SUPERVISION ROLE PLAYED BY RESPONDENTS[1]

ROLE	N	%
K-4 Supervision	1	0.97
K-6 Supervision	5	4.85
K-8 Supervision	6	5.83
K-12 Supervision	75	72.82
5-8 Supervision	0	0.00
7-12 Supervision	7	6.80
9-12 Supervision	4	3.88
Other		
4-8 Supervision	3	2.91
4-6 Supervision	1	0.97
6-12 Supervision	1	0.97
TOTALS	103	100.00

TABLE VI

RESPONDENTS YEARS AS SUPERVISOR
IN CURRENT SYSTEM

YEARS	N	%
25+	4	4.00
20-24	9	9.00
15-19	12	12.00
10-14	27	27.00
5-9	23	23.00
0-4	25	25.00
TOTALS	100	100.00

$\bar{x} = 10.37$

TABLE VII

SALARY OF RESPONDENTS

SALARY RANGE	N	%
$50,000 and over	2	2.11
$48,000 to $50,000	1	1.05
$46,000 to $48,000	6	6.32
$44,000 to $46,000	6	6.32
$42,000 to $44,000	17	17.89
$40,000 to $42,000	15	15.79
$38,000 to $40,000	16	16.84
$36,000 to $38,000	22	23.15
$34,000 to $36,000	3	3.16
$32,000 to $34,000	6	6.32
$30,000 to $32,000	1	1.05
TOTALS x=$39,673	**95**	**100.00**

TABLE VIII

MONTHS USED TO DETERMINE
SALARY OF RESPONDENTS

MONTHS		N	%
12		91	90.10
11.50		3	2.97
11.00		3	2.97
10.50		2	1.98
10.00		2	1.98
TOTALS	**x=11.89**	**101**	**100.00**

TABLE IX

JOB DESCRIPTION OF RESPONDENTS

JOB DESCRIPTION	N	%
Yes	100	98.04
No	2	1.96
TOTALS	**102**	**100.00**

TABLE X

RESPONDENT'S TOTAL NUMBER OF YEARS AS SUPERVISOR

YEARS		N	%
25+		5	5.00
20-24		9	9.00
15-19		11	11.00
10-14		32	32.00
5-9		23	23.00
0-4		20	20.00
TOTALS	**x=11.01**	**100**	**100.00**

TABLE XI

COLLEGES/UNIVERSITIES GRANTING BACHELOR'S DEGREES TO RESPONDENTS

INSTITUTIONS	N	%
Eastern Kentucky	20	19.42
Kentucky State	0	0.00
Morehead State	10	9.71
Murray State	7	6.80
Northern Kentucky	1	0.97
University of Kentucky	9	8.74
University of Louisville	1	0.97
Western Kentucky University	14	13.59
Other in-state	26	25.24
Out-of-state	15	14.56
TOTALS	**103**	**100.00**

TABLE XII

COLLEGES/UNIVERSITIES GRANTING
MASTER'S DEGREES TO RESPONDENTS

INSTITUTIONS	N	%
Eastern Kentucky	21	20.39
Kentucky State	0	0.00
Morehead State	12	11.65
Murray State	12	11.65
Northern Kentucky	1	0.97
University of Kentucky	3	2.91
University of Louisville	1	0.97
Western Kentucky University	30	29.13
Other in-state	4	3.88
Out-of-state	19	18.45
TOTALS	**103**	**100.00**

TABLE XIII

COLLEGES/UNIVERSITIES GRANTING
ED.S. OR CERTIFICATION

INSTITUTIONS	N	%
Eastern Kentucky	21	23.08
Kentucky State	0	0.00
Morehead State	13	14.29
Murray State	13	14.29
Northern Kentucky	1	1.10
University of Kentucky	3	3.30
University of Louisville	2	2.20
Western Kentucky University	28	30.75
Other in-state	1	1.10
Out-of-state		
Austin Peay, TN	1	1.10
Xavier, OH	6	6.59
University of AL	1	1.10
University of Cincinnati	1	1.10
TOTALS	91	100.00

WKU—Printing paid from state funds. KRS 57.375.

TABLE XIV

SATISFACTION REGARDING IN-SERVICE
BY RESPONDENTS

IN-SERVICE RATING	N	%
Entirely satisfactory	5	5.00
Mostly satisfactory	49	49.00
Equally satisfactory/ unsatisfactory	31	31.00
Mostly satisfactory	12	12.00
Entirely unsatisfactory	3	3.00
TOTALS	**100**	**100.00**

TABLE XV

SATISFACTION REGARDING CERTIFICATION
STANDARDS BY RESPONDENTS

CERTIFICATION	N	%
Entirely satisfactory	7	6.86
Mostly satisfactory	64	62.74
Equally satisfactory/ unsatisfactory	15	14.71
Mostly unsatisfactory	14	13.73
Entirely unsatisfactory	2	1.96
TOTALS	**102**	**100.00**

Σ1

TABLE XVI

OPINION OF MERIT PAY BY RESPONDENTS

FAVOR MERIT PAY	N	%
Yes	47	47.96
No	51	52.04
TOTALS	98	100.00

TABLE XVII

MAJOR CONSTRAINTS FACED
BY RESPONDENTS

CONSTRAINTS	N	%
Many responsibilities	36	22.64
Time	33	20.75
Paperwork	14	8.81
Lack of Funding	13	8.18
Money (Salary)	13	8.18
Lack of authority	7	4.40
Legal constraints	4	2.52
Other	39	24.52
TOTALS	**159**	**100.00**

TABLE XVIII

POSITION HELD PRIOR TO SUPERVISION

POSITION	N	%
Classroom teacher	43	40.96
Athletic coach	1	0.95
Principalship	35	33.33
Ass't Principalship	3	2.86
Other Positions	23	21.90
OTHER	105	100.00

TABLE XIX

TYPE OF SYSTEM IN WHICH RESPONDENT
IS SUPERVISOR

TYPE OF SYSTEM	N	%
Public	103	98.10
Private	2	1.90
TOTALS	**105**	**100.00**

TABLE XX

5-YEAR RETIREMENT PROJECTIONS
OF RETIREMENT

RETIRE IN 5 YEARS	N	%
Yes	46	45.10
No	56	54.90
TOTALS	102	100.00

TABLE XXI

MEMBERSHIP HELD BY RESPONDENTS

MEMBERSHIP	N	%
KASEP	4	1.15
KASA	85	24.43
KAES	70	20.11
KEA	33	9.48
KACD	15	4.31
KASCD	35	10.06
NASEP	2	0.57
ASCD	41	11.78
NEA	35	10.06
Other	28	8.05
TOTALS	**348**	**100.00**

TABLE XXII

PRIMARY REASON FOR BECOMING A SUPERVISOR
AS REPORTED BY RESPONDENTS

Reason	N	%
Income	23	22.33
Prestige	2	1.94
Improve academic performance	22	21.36
Make educational improvement	25	24.27
Springboard	0	0.00
Desire for leadership	20	19.42
Encouragement of others	7	6.80
Others	4	3.88
TOTALS	**103**	**100.00**

TABLE XXIII

SECONDARY REASON FOR BECOMING A SUPERVISOR
AS REPORTED BY RESPONDENTS

REASON	N	%
Income	24	24.24
Prestige	6	6.06
Improve academic performance	25	25.26
Make educational improvement	23	23.23
Springboard	3	3.03
Desire for leadership	8	8.08
Encouragement	9	9.09
Other	1	1.01
TOTALS	**99**	**100.00**

TABLE XXIV

TERTIARY REASON FOR BECOMING A SUPERVISOR
AS REPORTED BY RESPONDENTS

REASON	N	%
Income	13	13.98
Prestige	8	8.60
Improve academic performance	12	12.90
Make educational improvement	17	18.28
Springboard	10	10.75
Desire for leadership	20	21.51
Encouragement by others	13	13.98
TOTALS	**93**	**100.00**

TABLE XXV

10-YEAR PROJECTION OF RETIREMENT
BY RESPONDENTS

RETIRE IN 10 YEARS	N	%
Yes	82	84.54
No	15	15.46
TOTALS	**97**	**100.00**

TABLE XXVI

NUMBER OF HOURS WORKED BY RESPONDENTS

HOURS ON JOB	N	%
60+	9	8.82
55-59	4	3.92
50-54	36	35.30
45-49	21	20.59
40-44	24	23.53
35-39	7	6.98
30-34	1	0.98
TOTALS	102	100.00

$\bar{x} = 45.98$

TABLE XXVII

NUMBER OF STUDENTS IN
RESPONDENT'S SCHOOL DISTRICT

ENROLLMENT	N	%
10,000+	3	2.97
5,000 to 10,000	15	14.85
3,000 to 4,9999	20	19.81
2,000 to 2,900	27	26.73
1,500 to 2,000	16	15.84
1,000 to 1,499	11	10.89
500 to 999	9	8.91
TOTALS	**101**	**100.00**

FINDINGS

The mean age of the responding instructional supervisor in Kentucky was 47 years of age. More than half, 56.56 percent, of the respondents were between 40 and 50 years of age. This figure was consistent with similar studies of principals in Kentucky (Richardson, Cline, and Flanigan, 1988) and Tennessee, (Richardson, 1988).

Surprisingly, almost half of the respondents 46.05 percent, were female. This was not consistent with similar studies of educational administrators. Also surprising was the marital status of the respondents with only 84 percent married which was considerably less than similar studies of principals.

Almost of the respondents were white. Again, this was unexpected considering the percent of minority educational administrators in the Commonwealth particularly in Jefferson County.

Almost three-fourths, 72.82 percent, of the respondents were responsible for supervision from kindergarten through grade 12. This was consistent with the typical rural population and small school districts in Kentucky which have only one supervisor. With over 170 school districts and only 184 identified instructional supervisors, the predominant role of the supervisor was expected to be K-12.

Respondents reported employment as a supervisor in the current school system for a mean of 10.27 years, with 48 percent reporting employment for nine years or less. Supervisors did not

exhibit mobility as there was so little difference in the years of experience. However, with the predominant pattern of one supervisor per district, mobility would almost be restricted to movement between school systems rather than within school systems.

Respondents reported a mean salary of $39,673 with almost three-fourths, 73.67 percent, reporting a salary between $36,000 and $44,000. Only two respondents had a salary over $50,000, and only one had a salary of less than $32,000. The wide discrepancy in salaries was attributable to training, years of experience, and local contribution to salary. Similarly, most respondents, 91.10 percent, reported working twelve months to earn the salary. The mean number of months worked was 11.89. An overwhelming percentage, 98.04 percent, also reported having a job description.

The largest percentage of respondents, 25.24 percent, obtained their bachelor's degree from a private college or university located in Kentucky. The figures should have some serious implications for state universities when one-fourth of all the instructional supervisors attended a private college in the Commonwealth.

The largest number of respondents, 29.13 percent, obtained their master's degree from Western Kentucky University. Eastern Kentucky University was next with 20.39 percent, followed by those trained out-of-state with 18.45 percent of the respondents. Western Kentucky University also trained the largest number of instructional supervisors who held either an education specialist

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

degree or rank I certification with 30.75 percent of the respondents. Next was Eastern Kentucky University and Murray State University, both with 14.29 percent. Additionally, only six respondents reported holding a doctorate with only two of those being obtained in Kentucky, one each from the University of Louisville and the University of Kentucky, and the remainder being obtained outside the state. This is a concern that needs to be addressed. Are most of the best and brightest going outside the state for training? If so, are they returning to Kentucky, or are they permanently lost to other states?

Respondents were basically satisfied with both in-service training and current certification standards. Slightly more than 15 percent expressed dissatisfaction. Considering the problems experienced with current administrative certification programs, the lack of dissatisfaction was surprising. However, most of these supervisors would not be affected since they have been in their current positions for several years on the average.

The respondents were almost equally divided in their opinion of merit pay for administrators. This figure is reflective of the national uncertainty about the proposal.

Respondents believed that the major constraints affecting their effectiveness were "too many responsibilities", 22.64 percent, and "time" (or lack there of), 20.75 percent. The reference to time is almost universal among educational administrators. However, the implication of the "many responsibilities" are numerous. Obviously, instructional supervisors perceive that they wear too many hats and are pulled

in too many directions. They believe this lack of consistency impedes their success in their primary role, supervision. In many smaller districts the instructional supervisor is all things, from the assistant superintendent to the director of special projects and all those functions in between. Clearly, the role of instructional supervisor should be more carefully defined.

Most respondents had been a principal (33.33 percent) or a classroom teacher (40.96 percent) immediately before assuming the supervisors role. Obviously, many supervisors were selected based on their outstanding performance in the classroom. The evidence is not so clear with reference to principals; some could have been promoted based on either outstanding performance or lack of permanence. Most respondents, 98.10 percent, were supervisors in public school systems.

Of the respondents, 45.10 percent plan to retire in the next five years, and 84.54 percent plan to retire in the next ten years (Richardson, Cline, & Flanigan, 1988). This is considerably more than the retirement projections for the principalship where approximately 60 percent plan to retire in the next ten years. (Richardson, Cline, & Flanigan, 1988). If almost 85 percent plan to retire within the next ten years, colleges and universities should become busy preparing the next generation of instructional supervisors.

Most of the respondents belong to numerous professional organizations, with KASA and KAES being the most popular. Most belong to state organizations but not national organizations.

Respondents reported that the primary reason they entered supervision was to "make educational improvements" (24.27 percent). Their secondary reason was to "improve academic performance" (25.26 percent). Their tertiary reason was their "desire for leadership" (21.51 percent). Although "income" received high marks, most respondents listed personal achievement goals rather than monetary gain as the reason for entering instructional supervision. This is supported by most national studies examining the motivation of educators.

Most respondents, 35.30 percent, worked 50 to 54 hours per week and worked in a small (2,000 to 2,999 students) school district, 26.73 percent.

CONCLUSIONS

The findings present evidence to substantiate certain logical conclusions. Based on a thorough analysis of the data in this study, the following conclusions were reached:

1. Supervisors have too many responsibilities within the organizational framework of the school district.
2. Lack of time was also viewed as a serious impediment to the effectiveness of the instructional supervisor.
3. Most supervisors will be retiring during the next decade.
4. Almost one-fourth of the supervisors obtained their initial degree from a private institution in Kentucky.
5. Supervisors were basically satisfied with both in-service training and current certification practices.

6. Supervisors worked long hours in small school districts.
7. Supervisors were almost all white; few minorities were evident.
8. The gender of supervisors was almost equally divided between male and female.
9. Supervisors entered the profession to help others through improving academic performance and leadership.
10. Supervisors were initially selected from either the classroom or the principalship.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Acheson, K. A. & Gall, M. D., (1987). Techniques in the clinical supervision of teachers (2nd ed.). New York: Longman, Inc.

Alfonso, R. J., Firth, G., & Neville, R. (1984). The supervisory skill mix. Educational Leadership. 41, (7), 16-18.

Alfonso, R. J., Firth, G. R. & Neville, R. F. (1981). Instructional supervision: A behavior system. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Alfonso, R. J. & Goldsberry, L. F. (1982). Colleagueship in supervision. In T. J. Sergiovanni (Ed) Supervision and teaching pp. 90-107. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Blumberg, A. & Jonas, R. S. (1987). The teacher's control over supervision. Educational Leadership, 44 (8), 59-62.

Cogan, M. L. (1973). Clinical supervision Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Dunkleberger, G. E. (1982). Helping teachers to grow: Classroom observations -- what should principals look for? NASSP Bulletin 66 (458), 9-15.

Glickman, C. D. & Gordon, S. P. (1987). Clarifying developmental supervision. Educational Leadership, 44 (8), 64-68.

Goldsberry, L. F. (1984). The realities of clinical supervision Educational Leadership, 41 (7), 12-15.

Katz, R. L. (1955). The skills of an effective administrator. Harvard Business Review, 33-42.

Mann, F. C. (1965). Leadership and productivity. San Francisco: Chandler Publishing Company.

McGreal, T. L., Broderick, E., & Jones, J. (1984). Artifact collection. Educational Leadership, 41 (7), 20-21.

Reyes, D. J. (1986). Bringing together teacher evaluation observation, and improvement of instruction. The Clearing House, 59, 256-258.

Richardson, M. D., Cline, H. D., & Flanigan, J. L. (1988). The Kentucky principal: A self-perception. A paper presented at the annual meeting of the Mid-South Educational Research Association, Louisville, KY.

Richardson, M. D. (1988). A demographic profile of the Tennessee Principal. A paper presented at the annual meeting of the Southern Regional Council on Educational Administration, Atlanta, GA.

WKU—Printing paid from state funds. KRS 57.375.